

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/716,757	Applicant(s) CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Urmi Chattopadhyay	Art Unit 3738	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Reply Brief before interview

 (1) Urmi Chattopadhyay.

(3) _____.

 (2) Richard A. Arrett.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 1 June 2004
Time: 2:50pm
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

 If Yes, provide a brief description: *None*.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12

Prior art documents discussed:

None
Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed amending claims 1 and 11 to include "consisting of" language and claim 12 to include "entire" in order to clearly limit the entire inside surface to the second material or as being harder than the outside surface. Approved the inclusion of "at" in claim 3 to correct a grammatical error. Claim 5 was discussed as being broader in scope than claim 1, on which it depends, so claim 5 should be cancelled. Claims 7 and 8 are no longer withdrawn from consideration, and claim 7 was discussed to be amended to be commensurate in scope with claim 1, on which it depends. Discussed amending the first sentence of the specification to update priority information.